



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,158	12/02/2003	Simon Robert Walmsley	PEA24US	6703
24011 7590 09/26/2007 SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, 2041 AUSTRALIA			EXAMINER NALVEN, ANDREW L	
			ART UNIT 2134	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

80

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/727,158	WALMSLEY, SIMON ROBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew L. Nalven	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 and 20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments regarding the rejections under 35 USC § 112 are persuasive.
3. Applicant's remaining arguments filed 17 September 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant has argued in pages 1-2 that the Mi reference fails to teach the identifiers for the series are determined in such a way that knowing the identifier of one of the integrated circuits does not improve the ability of an attacker to determine the identifier of any of the other integrated circuits. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Mi's identifier (processor number) is statistically unique. An attacker knowing a statistically unique number would not assist the attacker in determining the identifier of any of the other integrated circuits. Applicant has provided no basis for the assertion that knowing a statistically unique would aid an attacker. Further, the limitation in question is not a method step nor does it provide any structural elements that distinguish it from the prior art. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (MPEP 2106). Because the cited limitation fails to provide any

Art Unit: 2134

method steps or structural elements it does not effect the scope of the claim and its effect upon the scope of the claim will be limited. As a result, Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 1 in view of the Mi reference.

5. The rejections appearing below are identical to those presented in the prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)** as being anticipated by Mi et al US PGPub 2002/0116616.

7. **With regards to claim 1**, Mi teaches determining a method of manufacturing a series of integrated circuits having related functionality, the method including the steps of determining an identifier (Mi, paragraph 0021, processor number), permanently storing the identifier on one of the integrated circuits (Mi, paragraph 0021, stored in a constant ROM or processor ID register), repeated steps (a) and (b) for each integrated

circuit in the series (Mi, paragraph 0021, more than one device has processor number), wherein the identifiers for the series are determined in such a way that knowing the identifier of one of the integrated circuits does not improve the ability of an attacker to determine the identifier of any of the other integrated circuits (Mi, paragraph 0021, statistically unique for a given processor).

8. **With regards to claim 2**, Mi teaches the identifier for each integrated circuit is determined using a stochastic mechanism thereby rendering highly improbably that replication of some or all of the series of identifiers stored on the series of the integrated circuits (Mi, paragraph 0021, statistically unique).

9. **With regards to claim 3**, Mi teaches each of the integrated circuits incorporates an identifier determined and stored in accordance with claim 1 (Mi, paragraph 0021, more than one device has processor number).

10. **With regards to claim 5**, Mi teaches the integrated circuit operable in a first and second mode (Mi, paragraph 0042, authorized or unauthorized state), wherein in the first mode, supervisor code can access the identifier (Mi, paragraphs 0042-0043, applets that are verified and authorized can access processor number) and in the second mode, user code cannot access the identifier (Mi, paragraphs 0042-0043, applets that are not verified and not authorized cannot access processor number).

11. **With regards to claim 7**, Mi teaches the identifier mapped into a key K (Mi, paragraph 0024, identifier mapped into XOR result of identifier-211 and secret key).

12. **With regards to claim 8**, Mi teaches that K is the identifier (Mi, paragraph 0021, processor number).

13. **With regards to claim 9**, Mi teaches K is created by applying a hash function or one-way function to the identifier (Mi, paragraph 0024, identifier is hashed using SHA-1 or MD5).

14. **With regards to claim 10**, Mi teaches the integrated circuit configured to produce and output a message from the integrated circuit (Mi, paragraph 0030, client computer sends return value to server) the message including a result of encrypting K (Mi, paragraph 0030, paragraph 0031, paragraph 0024, second XOR on intermediate value-K using session identifier).

15. **With regards to claim 11**, Mi teaches injecting a key into a target integrated circuit (Mi, paragraph 0030, server receives return value) comprising the step of receiving the message generated by the first integrated circuit of claim 10, and transferring a second key into the target integrated circuit (Mi, paragraph 0030, server receives return value), the second key being based on K (Mi, paragraph 0024, second XOR on intermediate value-K using session identifier).

16. **With regards to claim 12**, Mi teaches generating the second key by manipulating K with a function (Mi, paragraph 0024, K manipulated using second XOR function).

17. **With regards to claim 13**, Mi teaches the function uses K and a code associated with the target integrated circuit as operands (Mi, paragraph 0024, function uses K and session identifier associated with session between client and server).

18. **With regards to claim 14**, Mi teaches that the code is a code that is relatively unique to the target integrated circuit (Mi, paragraph 0023).

Art Unit: 2134

19. **With regards to claim 15**, Mi teaches K and the second key enabling secure communication between the first integrated circuit and the target integrated circuit (Mi, paragraph 0031, K and return value-second key are used by server to determine if access is permitted, paragraph 0036).

20. **With regards to claim 16**, Mi teaches the second integrated circuit configured to communicate securely with a third integrated circuit (Mi, paragraphs 0052-0054, web server communicates with those seeking to participate in a teleconference), thereby enabling it to act as an intermediary between the first integrated circuit and the third integrated circuit (Mi, paragraphs 0052-0054, web server acts as intermediary between members of the teleconference) allowing secure communication there between (Mi, paragraph 0055).

21. **With regards to claim 17**, Mi teaches the first and third integrated circuits do not share a key for use in the secure communication (Mi, paragraph 0061, web server acts as a gatekeeper).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. **Claims 4, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Mi et al US PGPub 2002/0116616 in view of Debry US Patent No. 6,314,521.

23. **With regards to claim 4**, Mi fails to teach the integrated circuits being printer controllers. However, Debry teaches each integrated circuit being a printer controller (Debry, column 8 lines 18-29, unique encryption key embedded in each manufactured printer). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Debry's method of placing unique identifiers within printer controllers because it offers the advantage of allowing a printer to be able to prove to a sender that it is the actual printer device that the printer purports to be (Debry, column 5 lines 65-67, column 6 lines 4-11).

24. **With regards to claim 18**, Mi teaches a first integrated circuit configured to perform an authenticated read of a third integrated circuit by securely communicating via the second integrated circuit (Mi, paragraph 0061, server forwards identifiers), but fails to teach the first integrated circuit being a print controller. However, Debry teaches an integrated circuit being a printer controller (Debry, column 8 lines 18-29, unique encryption key embedded in each manufactured printer). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Debry's method of placing unique identifiers within printer controllers because it offers the advantage of allowing a printer to be able to prove to a sender that it is the actual printer device that the printer purports to be (Debry, column 5 lines 65-67, column 6 lines 4-11).

25. **With regards to claim 20**, Mi as modified teaches the authenticated read relating to monitoring or updating usage of a resource (Debry, column 8 lines 18-30 and 53-56, printer is updated with digital certificate).

26. **Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Mi et al US PGPub 2002/0116616 in view of Collins et al US Patent No. 7,055,029.

27. **With regards to claim 6**, Mi fails to teach the supervisor mode being available to a program upon verification of that program by a boot program of the integrated circuit. However, Collins teaches teach the supervisor mode being available to a program upon verification of that program by a boot program of the integrated circuit (Collins, column 5 lines 7-15, column 9 line 65 – column 10 line 17, control of processor is transferred to black-boot program upon verification). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Collin's method of verifying program using a boot program because it offers the advantage of ensuring the security of the computer system itself and of all processes handled by the computer system (Collins, column 2 lines 40-49).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

28. Cordery et al US Patent No. 6,064,989 discloses a method of synchronization of cryptographic keys between two modules.

29. DeBry US Patent No. 6,385,728 discloses a method for providing will call certificates for guaranteeing authorization for a printer to retrieve a file directly from a file server.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L. Nalven whose telephone number is 571 272 3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 2134

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571 272 3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Nalven




KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER